

technical corrections to further enhance the operation of the Impact Aid Program and I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume for a colloquy with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL].

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL].

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding. I regret that I have not had the opportunity to take a good long look at the details at least, or the ramifications of the amendment that was affixed to this bill in the Senate.

I represent several school districts in my district back in Illinois which receive section 8002 funds, and I am very concerned that an amendment, or the amendment that was affixed to this bill in the Senate would essentially provide that a large portion of new funding, I guess we cannot ascertain just how much, for this program would go to one particular school district in 1997, and, more importantly, every fiscal year thereafter.

That does concern me, because, of course, there are a lot of districts throughout this country who are not getting full funding as it is right now, and if all future increases in appropriations were to be subject to this amendment, I think I would have to object.

I would request, therefore, of the chairman, and perhaps the ranking member might want to have something to say about this, that we revisit this issue at a later date, with the understanding that an adjustment would be made so that the changes in the distribution formula are not in effect for every increase in appropriations for future fiscal years, but would be basically in effect only for the fiscal year that we are dealing with, fiscal year 1997, and not for future fiscal years. That is the deep concern I have.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the gentleman is correct. There will be other changes in the future. This is one. That particular school district was West Point, which is one of our academies that was impacted due to a special significance. It was not my district or any particular district, but it was a military academy that was being affected.

But I agree. To be fair, we need to make sure that one district does not get all of the dollars, and that it is equalized. We will revisit this in the next Congress.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman. So there would be an assumption that we would limit the benefits of this bill, insofar as that one particular district is concerned, to the increase in appropriations for this fiscal year, and not for future fiscal years.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON].

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, in a colloquy just heard between the gentleman from California, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. FAWELL, a request on the part of Mr. FAWELL was that we revisit the issue of impact aid in the future Congresses. I would remind all Members that we revisit the issue of impact aid in every Congress, and I am glad we are revisiting it in this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentleman from California, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the chairman of the full committee, Mr. GOODLING, for the job they have done in recognizing there are and were and probably will be some inequities in this very complicated formula.

Mr. Speaker, what makes it complicated is that in each State, because each State and locality has a different method of funding their schools, from time to time the Federal formula does not work as we would intend it to. Therefore, from time to time we need to make changes and modifications and adjustments to the formula.

In one case in particular, for example, in New Jersey, it happens to be in my district, North Hanover Township, there is the school that provides the educational facilities and programs for the boys and girls who are dependents of the Air Force families at McGuire Air Force Base. North Hanover Township has 85 percent of its student body which comes from military dependents from McGuire Air Force Base. In this case, in 1994 the North Hanover school district lost or did not receive almost \$2 million which was intended to support those military dependent children. So this bill makes that correction and restores those funds for this school and benefits a large number of military dependent children.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very fine effort on the part of this Congress and in particular on the part of the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], and I urge support for this bill.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, all I would say is some of the things we work with in Congress are on a bipartisan basis, and this is one of them. Quite often when you are taking a look at the amount of dollars available from the Federal Government to go to specific programs, then we can reach a consensus on both sides of the aisle.

I would like to thank the new gentleman to the committee, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr.

BLUMENAUER], for his partnership, as well as the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK], who has worked diligently on this particular bill, and the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY], and a host of others.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 3269.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the Senate amendment to H.R. 3269.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE ACT OF 1996

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3864) to reform the management practices of the General Accounting Office, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3864

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "General Accounting Office Act of 1996".

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO LAWS AUTHORIZING AUDITING, REPORTING, AND OTHER FUNCTIONS BY THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

SEC. 101. TRANSFERS AND TERMINATIONS OF FUNCTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) FUNCTIONS TRANSFERRED.—In any case in which a provision of law authorizing the performance of a function by the Comptroller General of the United States or the General Accounting Office is amended by this title to substitute another Federal officer, employee, or agency in that authorization, the authority under that provision to perform that function is transferred to the other Federal officer, employee, or agency.

(2) FUNCTIONS TERMINATED.—In any case in which a provision of law authorizing the performance of a function by the Comptroller General of the United States or the General Accounting Office is repealed by this Act, the authority under that provision to perform that function is terminated.

(3) DELEGATION OF FUNCTIONS.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget may delegate, in whole or in part, to any other agency or agencies any function transferred to or vested in the Director under section 103(d), 105(b), 116, or 202(n) of this Act,